arXiv:1702.06831v1 [q-bio.QM] 20 Feb 2017

Using Redescription Mining to Relate Clinical and Biological Characteristics of Cognitively Impaired and Alzheimer's Disease Patients

Matej Mihelčić[1,2], Goran Šimić[3], Mirjana Babić Leko[3], Nada Lavrač[2,4], Sašo Džeroski[2,4], Tomislav Šmuc[1]

1 Division of Electronics, Ruđer Bošković Institute, Zagreb, Croatia
2 International Postgraduate School, Jožef Stefan Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia
3 Department for Neuroscience, Croatian Institute for Brain Research, University of Zagreb Medical School, Zagreb, Croatia
4 Department of Knowledge Technologies, Jožef Stefan Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia

* matej.mihelcic@irb.hr

Abstract

Based on a set of subjects and a collection of descriptors obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative database, we use redescription mining to find interpretable rules revealing associations between these determinants which provides insights about the Alzheimer's disease (AD). In particular, we applied a four-step redescription mining algorithm (CLUS-RM), which has been extended to engender constraint-based redescription mining (CBRM) and enables several modes of targeted exploration of specific, user-defined associations. Redescription mining enabled us to find specific constructs of clinical and biological descriptors describing many groups of subjects of different size, homogeneity and with different levels of cognitive impairment. To a large extent we confirmed known findings, previously reported in the literature. However, several redescriptions contained biological descriptors that differentiated well between the groups and for which connection to AD is still not completely explained. Examples include testosterone, ciliary neurotrophic factor, brain natriuretic peptide, insulin, macrophage migration inhibitory factor, Fas ligand and stem cell factor. The imaging descriptor Spatial Pattern of Abnormalities for Recognition of Early AD and levels of leptin and angiopoietin-2 in plasma were also found to be remarkably good descriptors, that may provide better understanding of AD pathogenesis. Finally, the most intriguing and novel finding was the high association of the Pregnancy-Associated Protein-A (PAPP-A) with cognitive impairment in AD. The high importance of this finding lies in the fact that PAPP-A is a metalloproteinase, known to cleave insulin-like growth factor binding proteins. Since it also shares similar substrates with A Disintegrin and Metalloproteinase family of enzymes that act as α-secretase to physiologically cleave amyloid precursor protein (APP) in the non-amyloidogenic pathway, it could be directly involved in metabolism of APP very early during the disease course. Therefore, further studies should investigate the role of PAPP-A in the development of AD more thoroughly.

Introduction

Data mining techniques come in two main forms: supervised and unsupervised. Supervised data mining methods use information about instance association with one or

more functional groups or continuous values described by target attributes. These associations are used to train a model that can predict group membership to new instances or estimate the expected value of some continuous target variable. Unsupervised data mining techniques do not use information about the target variables and have many different goals.

The most open-ended data-mining technique clustering [1–5], finds and groups similar instances based on a predefined similarity measure. It is used when some obvious, natural grouping is unavailable but also to reveal new groups that were previously unknown to the researcher. However, since these approaches do not create interpretable rules, users have to perform statistical analysis of obtained clusters and manually find interesting correlations between different attributes. A special form of clustering called conceptual clustering [6, 7] aims at finding clusters that can be described with concepts derived by using some description language.

Association rule mining [8] is an unsupervised method with a different goal. It finds implication associations between different attributes. These associations are usually selected by defining a threshold on observed frequency of items for which the one-directional association is valid or the proportion of items satisfying antecedent for which the consequent is also valid.

Subgroup discovery [9, 10] finds queries describing groups of instances having unusual and interesting statistical properties on their target variable which are often unavailable in purely descriptive tasks while Contrast Set Mining [11] identifies monotone conjunctive queries that best discriminate between instances containing one target class from all other instances.

Redescription mining, introduced by Ramakrishnan et al. [12], finds different subsets of items that can be characterized by using one or more sets of disjoint attributes (also called views). Such subsets that can be described by different sets of attributes are considered relevant knowledge that should be explored in more detail. As opposed to association rule mining that provides one-directional associations (implications), the redescription mining provides stronger equivalence relations between sets of attributes contained in redescription queries. One can obtain redescriptions from association rules by combining two or more association rules, using appropriate views to construct antecedent and consequent, into redescriptions. Such approach, however, can not match redescription mining in the quality and quantity of produced redescriptions. Properties of redescription mining makes it suitable to use in relating different biological attributes, for many of which the role and the effects to the cognitive impairment is still unknown or only scarcely explored, to the clinical attributes used to detect the potential impairment and make the preliminary diagnosis. At the same time, the approach allows combining results of many different cognitive tests which increases the reliability of obtained results. Compared to single or multi-view clustering, redescription mining produces short and comprehensive rules describing groups of instances. Also, there is an important difference in the clusters produced by these approaches. Clustering groups instances based on their similarity in values of one or more sets of attributes which allows one instance to be added to a group even though its similarity in smaller subset of attributes is not necessarily large. Redescription mining enforces strict rules for membership in a group. All instances must be described by exact queries which must be logically valid for all instances in a group. This, combined with the goal of creating short and understandable redescriptions makes the comparison between obtained groups in clustering and redescription mining very difficult. Unlike conceptual clustering, redescription mining allows describing similar sets of instances with more than one set of descriptors which is necessary to relate clinical and biological attributes.

Two-view data association discovery [13] aims at finding a small, non - redundant set of associations that provide insight in how two views are related. Produced associations

can be implications or equivalences as opposed to redescription mining that only produces equivalence associations providing interesting descriptions of instances. This approach is interesting, though we aim at discovering interesting associations between different sets of attributes on different support levels and relating it to the AD, instead of using compressed representations of associations between the views which might reveal better structure but could more easily omit attributes potentially interesting for investigation.

In this work, we analyse the data obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database [14], containing clinical and biological measurements (listed at `http://adni.bitbucket.org/`) for subjects tested for presence of Alzheimer's disease (AD) and the level of subject's cognitive impairment. These attributes and connections between them have been studied before [15–18] in order to improve the understanding and gain new insights about Alzheimer's disease (AD). The clinical attributes contain numerous questionnaires and assignments designed to test cognition and memory with the hope of early detection of AD. These tests are carefully designed, studied and regularly updated to increase the detection of various forms of cognitive impairment. Many such tests exist [19], but there is no unique measure [17] which can be used to reliably make the diagnosis. Thus, there are many benefits of combining different tests to obtain more reliable results. The biological attributes contain a number of brain images such as MRI and PET scans with some related and derived scores. Biological attributes also contain several blood tests and information about the subjects' genetic markers. These attributes are less reliable, but actively researched to aid in the detection of AD and to understand the processes that cause it. Our goal is to relate clinical attributes, potentially combining many different cognitive tests, with still unexplored biological attributes and combinations thereof. This allows the analysis of biological attributes and their values, increasing our understanding of potential causes and effects of different levels of cognitive impairment. We use information about the level of subjects cognitive impairment (target class) as independent information to assess the homogeneity of described groups, to relate descriptions of groups with higher level of impairment to subjects with normal cognition and to assess the overall interest in obtained redescription for our analysis. Unlike subgroup discovery which searches groups with unusual distribution of target variable, we are interested in groups describing patients with high level of cognitive impairment and consider homogeneous groups, with respect to the target variable, as very interesting for exploration.

A major benefit of using redescription mining is that it provides short and understandable rules describing a set of subjects of interest. These rules can be examined and analysed, thus making it easier to form testable hypothesis that can be studied and developed further.

Redescription mining

We apply redescription mining [12] on a dataset D, containing $|D|$ instances and two disjoint sets of attributes (views, denoted with W_1 and W_2) describing these instances. Redescriptions are tuples of queries, containing one query per view. Each query is a propositional logic formula that can contain conjunction, disjunction or negation operators and is used to define conditions on values of a subset of attributes from a particular view. Since in this work we use two views, all redescriptions have a form $R = (q_1, q_2)$. We denote a set of instances described by a query q_i with $supp(q_i)$. The support of a redescription is the set of instances described by all queries that constitute this redescription. In our specific case: $supp(R) = supp(q_1) \cap supp(q_2)$. The approach works with Boolean, categorical or numerical attributes [20] with possible missing values [20–22].

Two main measures [23] are used to evaluate the quality of redescriptions: the Jaccard index and the p-value. The Jaccard index measures the accuracy of a redescription while the p-value denotes the statistical significance of observed redescription.

$$J(R) = \frac{|supp(q_1) \cap supp(q_2))|}{|supp(q_1) \cup supp(q_2)|}$$

For a redescription $R = (q_1, q_2)$, the marginal probability of a query q_1, q_2 is computed as $p_1 = \frac{supp(q_1)}{|D|}$ and $p_2 = \frac{supp(q_2)}{|D|}$ respectively. The corresponding p-value [23] is defined as:

$$pV(R) = \sum_{n=|supp(R)|}^{|D|} \binom{|D|}{n} (p_1 \cdot p_2)^n \cdot (1 - p_1 \cdot p_2)^{|D|-n}$$

For a given redescription $R = (q1, q2)$, the $pV(R)$ represents a probability of obtaining a set of a size equal to or larger than $supp(R)$ from a data set containing $|D|$ instances, as an overlap of sets $supp(q_1)$ and $supp(q_2)$, where corresponding queries q_1 and q_2 are selected independently at random with marginal probabilities p_1 and p_2.

Redescription $R_{ex} = (q_1, q_2)$, whose queries are defined as:
$q_1 : 0.0 \leq \text{GDTOTAL} \leq 2.0 \ \wedge \ \text{GDALIVE} = 0.0 \ \wedge \ \text{CDMEMORY} = 0.0$
$q_2 : 0.5 \leq \text{HMT18} \leq 16.0 \ \wedge \ -3.86 \leq \text{SPARE_AD} \leq -0.93,$
provides alternative description of 156 different normal control subjects. Query q_1 describes subjects with clinical attributes memory score (CDMEMORY), total score in geriatric depression scale (GDTOTAL), score on a question *Do you think its wonderful to be alive now?* (GDALIVE) while query q_2 describes subjects by using biological attributes such as percentage of Eosinophils (HMT18) and a Spatial Pattern of Abnormalities for Recognition of Early Alzheimer's disease (SPARE_AD). A set of subjects described by at least one query of redescription R_{ex} contains 220 subjects. The Jaccard index (accuracy) of this redescription is 0.709. For a majority of subjects that are described by at least one of these queries, both queries are valid. The redescription is statistically significant with the p-value $< 2 \cdot 10^{-17}$. That means that it is highly unlikely that we would observe a redescription of this support size or larger given that we combine two statistically independent queries, with marginal probabilities $p_1 = \frac{204}{820} = 0.25$ and $p_2 = \frac{172}{820} = 0.21$, into a redescription R_{ex}.

Several redescription mining algorithms with different properties exist in the literature. Ramakrishnan et al. [12]. present an algorithm to mine redescriptions based on decision trees, called the CARTwheels. The algorithm works by building two decision trees (one for each view) that are joined in the leaves. Redescriptions are found by examining the paths from the root node of the first tree to the root node of the second and the algorithm uses multiclass classification to guide the search between the two views. Other approaches include the approach proposed by Zaki and Ramakrishnan [24], which uses a lattice of closed descriptor sets to find redescriptions, the approach by Parida and Ramakrishnan [25] for mining exact and approximate redescriptions based on relaxation lattice, Gallo et al. [26] present the greedy algorithm and the MID algorithm based on frequent itemset mining.

Galbrun and Miettinen [20] extended the greedy approach by Gallo et al. [26] to allow using numeric and categorical data as opposed to previous approaches working only on Boolean data. Recently, two novel tree-based algorithms were proposed by Zinchenko [27], which explore using decision trees in a non-Boolean setting and present different methods of layer by layer tree construction, which allows using nodes at each level of the trees to create redescriptions.

To create redescriptions, we use the CLUS-RM algorithm [21, 22] based on Predictive Clustering trees (PCT) [28, 29]. The main advantage of this algorithm is that it can produce many different redescriptions that are used to optimize redescription sets of user-defined size. The redescriptions are chosen to be accurate, significant and maximally non redundant with respect to redescription supports and attributes in redescription queries. The comparative results with the ReReMi algorithm [20] (the only other state of the art redescription mining algorithm able to work with missing values) performed in [22] showed that redescription sets produced by this algorithm contain much larger number of diverse redescriptions (especially those containing only conjunction operator in its queries). It also showed that redescriptions created by CLUS-RM have higher accuracy than those produced by the ReReMi algorithm, based on a query non-missing Jaccard index, designed not to penalize redescription accuracy with instances that can not be evaluated, due to missing values, at any query contained in the redescription. Redescriptions containing only conjunction operator in its queries discover stronger connections between attributes than redescriptions containing all operators, because every attribute used in queries containing only conjunction operator must describe all instances from redescription support. At the same time, queries containing only conjunction operator are more understandable and usually shorter than those containing combination of all operators. Because of this, we believe applying CLUS-RM with restriction to use of conjunctions to ADNI data is the right choice that may reveal useful medical hypothesis that can be further developed by the domain experts.

Work related to understanding cognitive impairment

Considerable work has been oriented at understanding the role of biological or clinical attributes and determining the correlations between different attributes, as well as the predictive power of these attributes for assessing the level of cognitive impairment.

Researchers have used neural imaging (MRI, PET-scan etc.) [30–32] to predict levels of cognitive impairment. Doraiswarny et al. [33] studied PET images in the presence of cognitive decline. Donovan et al. [34] studied correlations between regional cortical thinning and the worsening of apathy and hallucinations. Guo et al. [35] studied the effects of intracranial volume to the association between clinical disease progression and brain atrophy or apolipoprotein E genotype. Hostage et al. [36] studied the effects of apolipoprotein E (APOE) $\varepsilon 4$ and $\varepsilon 2$ on hippocampal volume. Scientists have also studied the role of apolipoprotein E [37] in early mild cognitive impairment. This is just a sample of the huge set of studies of correlations between biological, clinical attributes and the level of cognitive impairment. The more extensive list can be found at `http://adni.loni.usc.edu/news-publications/publications/`.

Recently, Gamberger et al. [38] used a novel multi-layer clustering method to identify clusters of AD patients with respect to several clinical and biological descriptors [17]. The same method was applied [16] to detect differences between clusters containing male and female patients. Breskvar et al. used PCTs [18] to discover and analyse patient clusters. They focused on relations between biological features and the progression of AD by observing the behavioural response of patients and their study partners (persons who are in frequent contact with the patient, study with the patient, and are able to make the assessment on patients functioning in daily life).

Materials and Methods

In this section we briefly describe the main parts of the CLUS-RM redescription mining algorithm, the extensions made to the algorithm to allow constraint-based redescription

mining and provide a detailed description of datasets we created and used as a source of information about subjects suffering from different levels of cognitive impairment.

Algorithm description

All experiments are performed with the redescription mining algorithm ([21, 22]) that uses PCT [29] to find descriptions of groups of instances (i.e., groups of patients, as is the case in our medical study). The algorithm consists of four main parts: 1) Initialization, 2) Query creation, 3) Redescription creation and 4) Redescription set optimisation.

In the initialization phase, the algorithm makes a copy of each instance from the original dataset and shuffles the attribute values for the copies. For each attribute, the algorithm selects a random instance from the dataset and copies its value for the selected attribute to the target copy. The procedure brakes correlations between attributes in the copied instances and allows PCT to create initial clusters by distinguishing between original instances and copies containing shuffled values. Described procedure is repeated for both views contained in the dataset.

Each cluster obtained by the PCT is associated to a rule which is valid for this group of instances. The next step is to describe the same group of instances with the second attribute set. To do this, for each instance, the algorithm constructs a set of target variables containing equal number of targets as number of rules constructed using the first set of attributes. The instance has a target value 1 on position j if it is described by the j-th rule from a set of rules constructed on the first set of attributes, otherwise the value is 0. We use the multi-target classification and regression capability of PCT to construct clusters on different views containing similar instances. The procedure is repeated by creating initial rules on the second view and finding descriptions of similar sets of instances by using attributes from the first view.

Once the algorithm obtains rules for both views, it combines them by computing the Cartesian product of two rule-sets. Each redescription is evaluated with various redescription quality measures which are used, in combination with user predefined constraints (such as minimal redescription accuracy, minimal support, maximal p-value), to select candidates for redescription set optimization.

Each redescription satisfying all user quality constraints is a candidate for redescription set optimization. Redescriptions satisfying all user-defined constraints are added to the redescription set until the maximal number of redescriptions (user-defined parameter) is reached. When this number is reached, the algorithm computes the score difference, defined in [21, 22], between the new redescription and every redescription already contained in the redescription set based on redescription score. The score of some redescription R contained in the redescription set, based on described instances, is computed as $redScoreInst(R) = \frac{\sum_{i \in supp(R)}(instFreq[i]-1)}{\sum_{i \in D} instFreq[i]-|supp(R)|}$, where $instFreq[i]-1$ denotes the number of redescriptions from the redescription set different from R that describe the instance i. The redescription score based on attributes $redScoreAt(R) = \frac{\sum_{a \in attr(R)}(attrFreq[a]-1)}{\sum_{a \in attr(D)} attrFreq[a]-|attr(R)|}$, where $attr(R)$ denotes a set of all attributes occurring in queries of redescription R, $attr(D)$ denotes all attributes contained in all views of the dataset and $attrFreq[a]-1$ denotes the number of times this attribute is used in queries of all redescriptions from the redescription set except R. The score of a newly created redescription R_{new} is computed in the same way by using frequencies for all redescriptions except the one being compared with R_{new}. The error score is computed as $errSc(R) = 1.0 - J(R)$ and the final redescription score is computed as $sc(R) = \alpha_1 \cdot accSc(R) + \alpha_2 \cdot redScoreInst(R) + \alpha_3 \cdot redScoreAt(R)$, where $\alpha_i \in [0, 1]$, $\sum_{k=1}^{3} \alpha_i = 1$. The user - defined weights α_k regulate importance of different scores which affect the properties of the resulting redescription set. In this

work, we use $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{3}$. Redescription contained in the redescription set with the highest score difference with the newly created redescription is replaced thus improving the overall redescription set quality. At each redescription exchange all frequency scores are updated.

Constraint-based redescription mining

In this work, we extend CLUS-RM algorithm to constraint - based redescription mining setting. Constraint - based redescription mining, first defined in [24], allows placing additional constraints on redescriptions such as defining a set of attributes that must occur in redescription queries. The constraints are in the form $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1,\ C_2,\ \ldots,\ C_n\}$, where each constraint C_i specifies a set of attributes that must occur in redescription queries. At least one constraint C_i must be satisfied by a redescription to be presented to the user. We denote this original definition as strict constrained redescription mining. In practice, various less strict versions of contrainted redescription mining might be useful. That is why we allow two additional modes of constrained redescription mining:

1. Soft constraint - based redescription mining: there must exist at least one constraint $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ such that a part of defined attributes occurs in redescription queries. Satisfying larger portion of constraints is favoured by the redescription evaluation score.

2. Suggested constraint - based redescription mining: defined constraints are used as suggestions that increase the overall redescription score depending on the number of satisfied constraints, however high quality redescriptions not satisfying any of these constraints can also enter redescription set if their total score is high enough.

Suggested constraint - based redescription mining can be used when the expert, knowing the research domain, suggests a set of attributes that may be more interesting to explore, though at current stage there is no immediate focus on any particular hypothesis. Soft constraint - based redescription mining can be used when a set of attributes of interest has been determined but further study of their interactions is needed to form, refine or confirm the expert hypothesis. Strict constraint - based redescription mining can be used when the expert already has a hypothesis and wants to explore the specified associations in more detail.

To allow constraint - based redescription mining, we extend CLUS-RM algorithm with a new score *scConstr*, which is used in suggested constraint - based redescription mining to increase the overall score of a redescription satisfying user-defined attribute constraints. The score is defined as:
$scConstr(R) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot max\{\frac{|attr(R)\ \cap\ C_i|}{|C_i|},\ C_i \in \mathcal{C}\}\ +\ \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{|attr(R)\ \cap\ (\cup_i C_i)|}{|attr(R)|}$.

The first term in the score rewards redescriptions satisfying higher fraction of constraints from some set C_i. Due to the fact that more disjoint or partially overlapping constraint sets can be given and the fact that some redescriptions can satisfy parts of larger number of constraint sets C_i, we take the maximum score achieved among constraint sets as a quality of redescription - thus favouring compliance with larger number of constraints from a single constraint set. The second term favours redescriptions that, among the attributes contained in their queries, have larger fraction of attributes of interest to the user. Here, we reward satisfied constraints from any constraint set defined by the user.
The score used for soft constraint - based redescription mining is defined as:

$$redScoreSoft = \begin{cases} scConstr(R) & \text{if } \exists C_i \in \mathcal{C},\ attr(R) \cap C_i \neq \emptyset \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Similarly, the score used for strict constraint - based redescription mining is defined as:

$$redScoreStrict = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \exists C_i \in \mathcal{C},\ attr(R) \cap C_i = C_i \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Finally, redescription score $sc(R)$ is extended to: $sc(R) = \alpha_1 \cdot accSc(R) + \alpha_2 \cdot redScoreInst(R) + \alpha_3 \cdot redScoreAt(R) + \alpha_4 \cdot (1 - redScoreConst(R))$, where $\alpha_i \in [0, 1]$, $\sum_{k=1}^{4} \alpha_i = 1$ and $redScoreConst(R)$ denotes any variant of the constraint - based score chosen by the user. Redescriptions with the score value of ∞ are not allowed to enter redescription set.

With the proposed extension, the CLUS-RM is the only redescription mining algorithm capable of performing constraint - based redescription mining on categorical, numerical and data containing missing values.

Data description

For this study, we extracted data from the ADNI database [14]. The basis of our datasets was contained in the adnimerge data table, which contains measurement of several clinical (attributes derived by using questionnaires, observations by doctors and other tests measuring level of cognition) and biological attributes (different blod tests, genetic markers, brain images, volumes etc.) for 1,737 subjects. By examining these subjects, we noticed two distinct groups of subjects for whom some additional distinct attributes have been measured. Because of this, we created and studied three related datasets. The division of attributes to clinical and biological forms two disjoint sets of attributes that are used as views in redescription mining.

The first dataset (D_1) contained 1,737 subjects: 417 with the diagnosis of control normal (CN), 106 with significant memory concern (SMC), 310 with early mild cognitive impairment (EMCI), 562 with late mild cognitive impairment (LMCI) and 342 subjects diagnosed with AD. The dataset contained a number of biological attributes such as APOE genotype, different brain measurements, such as the volume of the whole brain, the hippocampus, ventricles and many other structures, including brain images obtained by using the ^{18}fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG)-PET method. The dataset contained various blood analysis such as levels of white and red blood cells, protein and glucose levels, and many others. It also contained a number of neuropsychological tests, such as the Alzheimer Disease Assessment Scale (ADAS11, ADAS13, etc.), several different Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Tests (RAVLT), Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE), Functional Assessment Questionnaire (FAQ) and others, including several attributes related to clinical dementia rating (CDR) and geriatric depression scale (GDS). Several features describing the subject's symptoms, such as nausea, vomiting, sweating and results of various neurological examinations were also included.

The second dataset (D_2) contained 918 subjects: 188 with diagnosis of CN, 106 diagnosed with SMC, 310 with EMCI, 164 with LMCI, and 150 suffering from AD. This dataset, in addition to features contained in the first dataset, contained several features describing subject performance on Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MOCA) and features related to the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) Scale of Performance Status. It also contained values of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) biomarkers, total tau and phospho-tau levels.

The third dataset (D_3) contained 820 subjects disjoint to the subjects from the second dataset. There were 229 subjects with diagnosis of CN, 0 with SMC, 1 with EMCI, 398 with LMCI and 192 with AD. It was extremely useful to study the differences and special properties of healthy subjects as compared to patients with severe stages of dementia. This dataset lacked information about ECOG Scale of Performance Status, MOCA and information about CSF biomarkers, but it contained several additional attributes related to hormones and proteins measured. It also contained information about total cranial vault segmentation and plasma biomarkers $A\beta_{1-40}$ and $A\beta_{1-42}$. One particularly useful imaging attribute measured Spatial

Pattern of Abnormalities and was specifically constructed to help in early detection of AD. The AD assessment scale contained many additional attributes corresponding to different cognitive tasks, the full set of attributes being publicly available on the ADNI web page `http://adni.loni.usc.edu/`.

Experiments

Our main goal was to study clinical and biological attributes, and to find interesting relations among them. To retrieve maximum information from and obtain deeper insight into the data, we divided redescriptions by the number of described subjects and used the diagnosis of the level of cognitive impairment to further assess the relevance and interestingness of the obtained redescriptions. For each dataset, we created four redescription sets containing redescriptions describing $[5, 10]$, $[11, 39]$, $[40, 99]$ and at least 100 patients. The maximum cluster size was set to approximately 50% of patients contained in the dataset. Descriptions of most interest in this study concern subsets of subjects diagnosed with AD or high level of cognitive impairment. Higher homogeneity of subjects described by such redescriptions, with respect to diagnosis, reflect the importance of the attributes used in redescription queries for the understanding of cognitive impairment. We use only conjunction operator as the most informative and interpretable logical operator. Each set contains 100 redescriptions with a minimal Jaccard Index of 0.2 and a maximal p-value of 0.01. Allowed support intervals, as well as other parameter limits were found through experimentation. The majority of redescriptions contained up to 8 attributes per query.

Since PAPP-A showed interesting associations with cognitive impairment in the experiments described above, we performed a constraint - based redescription mining with the same algorithmic parameters but focusing redescription search on redescriptions containing pregnancy associated plasma protein A (PAPP-A) in the redescription queries. We created one redescription set containing 100 redescriptions all of which describe at least 100 patients.

Results

We merged all four redescription sets created on each dataset ($D_1,\ D_2,\ D_3$) and formed one larger redescription set (RS) per dataset, denoted $R_1,\ R_2,\ R_3$. For the obtained redescriptions, contained in the corresponding redescription sets ($R_1,\ R_2,\ R_3$), we analysed the homogeneity of the described subsets of subjects with respect to the level of cognitive impairment (CN, SMC, EMCI, LMCI and AD) by computing the entropy of described subject's medical diagnosis (demonstated in Fig. 1). To get information about quality of redescription sets produced with different support intervals (1., 2., 3., 4. in Fig. 1), we plot entropy distributions (i in Fig. 1) and distributions of redescriptions' Jaccard index (ii in Fig. 1).

Dataset structure made it easier to distinguish between different groups of patients for dataset 3 which can be seen from Fig. 1. Here, we obtained many clusters of various size, homogeneous with respect to medical diagnosis, which gives us confidence that we found attribute combinations and numerical intervals useful for the analysis and understanding of cognitive impairment connected to AD.

The entropy increases with the increase of the number of described patients, while the Jaccard index shows stronger associations in redescriptions with support size in the first and the last interval. Redescriptions describing the smallest number of subjects (the last interval) use larger number of attributes with very specific numerical intervals to isolate groups of subjects that are very homogeneous with respect to the medical diagnosis and describe many different groups of patients suffering from severe cognitive

impairment (LMCI, AD). In contrast, many accurate redescriptions (in the first interval) use larger numerical intervals, thus often describing subjects with various levels of cognitive impairment. The algorithm, however, managed to find accurate redescriptions of subgroups of CN patients in this interval which, also contributes to accuracy higher than that for the middle two intervals. The data contains missing values and due to errors in measurements and data processing, we suspect that some level of noise is also present. Both factors negatively affect the Jaccard index.

By analysing redescription sets, we found useful information related to patients with cognitive impairment. From the clinical attributes, we noticed high usage of ADAS, MOCA, Geriatric Depression Scale, Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test (especially the percent forgetting), and Mini Mental State Exam (MMSE) attributes to describe patients suffering from various levels of cognitive impairment. Even though there are instances where some subjects with diagnosis CN fall in the identified intervals of values for these attributes. Attributes connected to Clinical dementia rating distinguish well between patients with diagnosis CN and those with different levels of impairment. Redescriptions mostly contain the attributes CDMEMORY, CDGLOBAL and CDR-SB (clinical dementia rating sum of boxes). From the biological attributes, we often encountered attributes connected to brain volume, hippocampus, various blood and urinary tests (attributes HMT and RCT), intra-cranial volume (ICV), ^{18}fluorodeoxyglucose - positron emission tomography (FDG-PET) and ^{18}F-florbetapir (AV45). These attributes have been studied before by Gamberger et al. [16, 17]. We noticed that the biological attribute called SPARE_AD (Spatial Pattern of Abnormalities for Recognition of Early AD) correlates very well with the subject's diagnosis and occurs frequently in redescriptions constructed on dataset 3 that contains it. Also, the gene variant APOE $\varepsilon 4$ is present exclusively in redescriptions describing patients diagnosed with LMCI and AD.

By observing redescriptions describing very homogeneous groups of patients with high level of cognitive impairment (LMCI and AD), we discovered groups where testosterone levels are significantly decreased. Although most studies (e.g. Zhao et al. [39]) and meta-analyses showed no differences in plasma levels of testosterone between AD and matched controls (e.g. Xu et al. [40]), there are some studies, such as the one of Hogervorst et al. [41], that found low free testosterone to be an independent risk factor for AD. Plasma testosterone levels display circadian variation, peaking during sleep, and reaching a lowest level in the late afternoon, with a superimposed ultradian rhythm with pulses every 90 min reflecting the underlying rhythm of pulsatile luteinizing hormone (LH) secretion [42]. The increase in testosterone during sleep requires at least 3 hours of sleep with normal sleep architecture. However, since noradrenergic locus coeruleus and serotonergic dorsal raphe nucleus are among the first neurons affected by neurofibrillary tau pathology, their changes lead to the early and prominent deterioration of the sleep-wake cycle in AD (for a review, see Šimić et al. [43]), which may add to a reduction of testosterone levels with advancing age. Experimental data obtained in animal models of AD suggest that low levels of testosterone increase Aβ and tau pathology through both androgen and estrogen pathways (testosterone is metabolized in the brain into androgen dihydrotestosterone, DHT, and 17β-estradiol, the E2 estrogen) [44, 45].

Unlike previous scarce data and negative correlation [46], we also found the levels of ciliary neurotrophic factor (CNTF) in plasma in several redescriptions describing subjects with high level of cognitive impairment, together with decreased levels of leptin. This is in agreement with the results of Marwarha and Ghribi [47], showing that lower leptin levels are detected in AD patients and that it can be a possible target for developing supplementation therapies for reducing the progression of AD. The same group of subjects had increased levels of plasma angiopoietin-2, which is in agreement



Fig 1. Entropy (i) and Jaccard index (ii) value distributions for the redescription sets created on each dataset (first dataset - R_1 at the top, third dataset - R_3 at the bottom). We create four redescription sets $1. - 4.$ per dataset so that the number of described subjects in each redescription (from a particular redescription set) falls in the corresponding interval shown on the y-axis.

with research by Thirumangalakudi et al. [48] and research by Grammas et al. [49], that revealed elevated expression of angiopietin-2 in the brains of AD subjects and the transgenic AD mice, respectively.

Increased levels of plasma brain natriuretic peptide (BNP) were found in several redescriptions containing patients with severe cognitive impairment. Previous research [50] suggested that this peptide has more significant association with vascular dementia than with AD. This could suggest either that this group of subjects, described by redescriptions containing BNP attribute, suffered from both types of dementia (mixed dementia), or that these cases do not suffer from AD but indeed suffer from vascular dementia.

Finally, we also found alteration in plasma levels of several other attributes, whose relationship with AD has been proven in the literature. This include increase in serum apolipoprotein B [51], plasma insulin [52], CSF macrophage migration inhibitory factor (MIF) [53] and Fas (CD95) ligand in AD brain [54]. They also include decrease in plasma and CSF levels of stem cell factor (SCF) [55].

For each redescription set, we extracted one interesting, statistically significant redescription and displayed its queries, along with the diagnosis distribution of the patients described by this redescription (demonstrated in Fig. 2).



Fig 2. Example redescriptions (one for each dataset), each describing at least 100 patients. All patients described are diagnosed with EMCI, LMCI or AD. ADNI tables containing attribute codes of the example redescriptions can be seen in electronic supplementary documents S1 Appendix, S2 Appendix and S3 Appendix. A short attribute descripton can be seen at `http://adni.bitbucket.org/`.

The three redescriptions (from top to bottom) describe 602, 118 and 365 patients, respectively with different proportion of EMCI, LMCI and AD diagnosis. The queries mostly contain well known attributes available at `http://adni.bitbucket.org/`. The clinical attributes contained are memory score, Clinical Dementia Rating Scale Sum of Boxes (CDRSB), judgement and problem solving score (CDJUDGE), Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale (ADAS), Mini Mental State Exam (MMSE). The biological attributes used contain neutrophils (HMT8), ^{18}F-florbetapir (AV45), ^{18}fluorodeoxyglucose - positron emission tomography (FDG-PET), Spatial Pattern of

Abnormalities for Recognition of Early Alzheimer's disease (SPARE_AD) and Pregnancy-Associated Protein-A (PAPP-A) measurements. The redescriptions are statistically significant and describe 46%, 20% and 62% of all patients with some level of cognitive impairment contained in the corresponding dataset.

Next, we provide a short list of pairwise associations between attributes for the analysed datasets. To obtain these associations we focused on redescriptions describing patients with some level of cognitive impairment. Further, we computed associations between pairs of attributes (bio-bio, clin-clin and bio-clin), measured by the number of their co-occurrences in the queries of selected redescriptions. The values of these co-occurences can be seen in Table 1. Finally, we merged all redescriptions computed on all three datasets to obtain global information about pairwise attribute associations (set $\cup_{i_1}^{3} R_i$). We do this for each attribute pair on all three datasets. Besides the associations, we also computed the pairwise attribute correlations, by using values of all subjects in the corresponding dataset for the selected pair of attributes, and the statistical significance of these correlations. For each attribute we performed the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to assess if its values, for subjects contained in the dataset, follow normal distribution. If we obtain p-values smaller than 0.05 for both attributes in the pair, we compute Pearson correlation coefficient, otherwise we compute the Spearman's correlation coefficient and the appropriate p-value of the corresponding significance test.

Table 1 shows high association between FDG-PET and the volume of the hippocampus, the entorhinal cortex, as well as an attribute related to the volume of the lateral ventricles. High association was also found between intracranial volume and creatine kinase levels. This enzyme is present in greatest amounts in skeletal muscle, myocardium, and brain. The FDG-PET attribute often occurred in the same descriptive rules as the attribute measuring the level of vitamin B12. Administering of vitamin B12 is known to sometimes improve cognition when there is insufficient level of B12 in the organism [56, 57]. The incidence of AD increases with age and in fact, elderly people show deficiency of vitamin B12, mainly due to the impaired vitamin B12 uptake in the gastrointestinal tract [58]. AD patients also have increased homocysteine levels in the blood. Since homocysteine is directly associated with brain atrophy, it is believed that vitamin B12 supplementation (that reduces homocysteine levels) can actually slow the progression of brain atrophy [56]. However, since meta-analyses failed to prove [59, 60] the connection of vitamin B12 supplementation with homocysteine levels and improved cognition, further studies should be conducted to resolve this issue. The correlation between FDG-PET and B12 values on our dataset was not statistically significant, though it may be more pronounced on a subset of subjects (for instance those above a certain age). It has been reported [61] that diagnosis based on FDG-PET can lead to false diagnoses of AD, where patients are cognitively normal or have reversible cognitive impairment.

The clinical attributes ADAS, MOCA, MMSE, CD, FAQ and RAVLT co-occurred frequently. Interestingly, the question number 13 (number of targets hit) from the ADAS test occurred very frequently in redescription queries. In this task, the participants are required to cross-out specific digits from a long list of digits. Correlations among the aforementioned attributes were strong and statistically significant.

There was a high association of the ADAS, CD and MOCA clinical attributes with FDG and SPATIAL_AD, the volume of the entorhinal cortex and the hippocampus, etc. Correlations between these attributes were statistically significant. One interesting association is that between CDRSB and PAPP-A which is used in screening tests for Down syndrome. CDRSB and PAPP-A were negatively correlated (-0.15) and the correlation was statistically significant at the significance level of 0.01.

Motivated by the statistically significant association between PAPP-A and CDRSB,

Table 1. Top five attribute associations as measured by attribute pair co-occurrence in redescription queries, given in the format (attribute1, attribute2): number of co-occurrences. In addition, the correlation coefficient and the significance of the correlation are given in the format C:[correlation, p-value], where $C = P$ denotes Pearson correlation coefficient and $C = S$ denotes Spearman's correlation coefficient. Associations are considered for pairs of biological (first column), and clinical (second column), as well as mixed (third column) attributes, for each of the redescription sets $R_1,\ R_2,\ R_3$ and their union $R_u = \cup_{i=1}^{3} R_i$.

Pairwise attribute associations and correlations			
RS	**Biological**	**Clinical**	**Clinical - Biological**
R_1	(Hipp., FDG) : 111 P : (0.42, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (FDG, Entorh.) : 106 P : (0.35, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (FDG, Ventr.) : 52 S : (-0.39, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (FDG, ICV) : 46 S : (-0.39, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (FDG, AV45) : 42 S : (-0.37, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$)	(ADS13, RVLTIm.) : 52 S : (-0.8, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (ADS13, Q13S.) : 49 S : (0.5, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (ADS13, CDMEM.) : 48 S : (0.71, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (ADS13, FAQ) : 45 S : (0.67, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (RVLTIm., CDMEM.) : 43 S : (-0.63, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$	(ADS13, FDG) : 197) S : (-0.58, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (ADS13, Entorh.) : 99 S : (-0.49, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (ADS13, Hipp.): 96 S : (-0.54, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (ADS11, FDG) : 79 S : (-0.55, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (CDMEM., FDG) : 69 S : (-0.49, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$
R_2	(FDG, Hipp.) : 86 P : (0.4, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (FDG, Entorh.) : 76 P : (0.31, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (FDG, AV45) : 52 S : (-0.37, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (FDG, RCT14) : 45 S : (0.124, 0.0003) (FDG, BAT126) : 31 S : (-0.007, 0.42)	(MOCA, ADS13) : 60 S : (-0.72, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (MOCA, EcgPtPl.) : 30 S : (-0.28, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (MOCA, CDMEM.) : 27 S : (-0.58, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (ADAS13, MMSE) : 24 S : (-0.64, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (ADAS13, CDRSB) : 23 S : (0.66, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$)	(ADS13, FDG) : 142 S : (-0.56, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (MOCA, FDG) : 124 S : (0.49, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (ADS13, Entorh.) : 52 S : (-0.38, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (MOCA, Hippc) : 44 S : (0.45, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (RVLTIm., FDG) : 42 S : (0.48, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$)
R_3	(SP_AD, PAPP-A) : 66 S : (-0.05, 0.1) (SP_AD, Entorh.) : 39 S : (-0.61, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (PLMNR., PAPP-A) : 18 S : (-0.05, 0.14) (SP_AD, TNC) : 17 S : (0.09, 0.014) (PAPP-A, Entorh.) : 15 S : (0.08, 0.039)	(ADS13, CDMEM.) : 60 S : (0.76, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) : 60 (MMSE, CDMEM) : 42 S : (-0.73, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (ADS13, CDRSB) : 34 S : (0.76, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) : 34 (ADS13, MMSE) : 30 S : (-0.71, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (FAQ, ADS13) : 29 S : (0.7, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$)	(ADS13, SP_AD) : 131 S : (0.68, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (CDMEM., SP_AD) : 110 S : (0.72, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (CDRSB, SP_AD) : 58 S : (0.7, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (MMSE, SP_AD) : 51 S : (-0.62, $< 2.2 \cdot 10^{-16}$) (CDRSB, PAPP-A) : 43 S : (-0.15, 0.0002)
$\bigcup_{i=1}^{3} R_i$	(Hipp., FDG) : 197 (FDG, Entorh.) : 182 (FDG, AV45) : 94 (FDG, Ventr.) : 68 (FDG, ICV) : 67	(ADS13, CDMEM.) : 122 (ADS13, FAQ) : 82 (ADS13, CDRSB) : 79 (ADS13, RVLTIm.) : 77 (ADS13, MMSE) : 77	(ADS13, FDG) : 339 (ADS13, Entorh.) : 171 (ADS13, Hipp.) : 136 (ADS13, SP_AD) : 131 (MOCA, FDG) : 124

Table 2. Top four associations of PAPP-A with other attributes based on attribute pair occurrences in redescription queries obtained by using constraint-based redescription mining. The numbers represent co-occurrence frequencies of attribute pairs in redescriptions. The produced redescription set contains 100 different redescriptions. Below the attribute pair, we give information about the correlation between the attributes in the same format as in Table 1.

Pairwise attribute associations and correlations	
Biological	**Clinical**
(SPARE_AD, PAPP-A) : 100	(CDMEMORY, PAPP-A) : 85)
S : (−0.05, 0.1)	S : (−0.11, 0.0034)
(Fus., PAPP-A) : 21	(CDRSB, PAPP-A) : 51
S : (0.11, 0.01)	S : (−0.15, 0.00019)
(Entorh., PAPP-A) : 20	(MMSE, PAPP-A): 49
S : (0.08, 0.039)	S : (0.13, 0.00088)
(Hipp., PAPP-A) : 13	(ADS13, PAPP-A) : 42
S : (0.01, 0.4)	S : (−0.11, 0.0056)

we used constraint-based redescription mining to focus only on redescriptions containing PAPP-A as one of the attributes in the redescription queries. The associations, obtained from the resulting redescription set containing 100 redescriptions, are presented in Table 2.

The associations presented in Table 2 show that PAPP-A occurs frequently in redescription queries together with the clinical tests CDMEMORY, CDRSB, MMSE and ADAS13. Correlations between PAPP-A and all these attributes were statistically significant at the significance level of 0.01. Interestingly, SPARE_AD and PAPP-A occurred in every redescription from the redescription set obtained with constraint-based redescription mining. As noted earlier, the correlation between these two attributes was not statistically significant when measured for all subjects in the dataset, however the correlation (Spearman's $\rho = -0.096$) was statistically significant (with $p = 0.026$) when measured for subjects with AD and LMCI at the significance level of 0.05. The fact that every redescription in the redescription set obtained with constraint-based redescription mining described exclusively subjects with AD and LMCI possibly explains the high frequency of association between those attributes and necessitates further exploration of the role of PAPP-A in AD and LMCI. Additionally, we found an interesting association between PAPP-A and two biological attributes: the volume of the entorhinal cortex and the volume of the fusiform gyrus. Correlations between PAPP-A and these biological attributes were statistically significant at the significance level of 0.05.

Conclusion

The redescription mining approach to segmenting high-dimensional datasets offers several advantages over classical clustering, subgroup discovery and association mining, such as the capability to generate relevant equivalence associations among combinations of attributes. We performed redescription mining experiments on three different datasets, created by extracting different sets of attributes from the ADNI database, and measured the redescription accuracy and the level of homogeneity (in terms of level of cognitive impairment) of the subjects described by each redescription. Basically, the main aim of our study was to differentiate between cognitively normal subjects and those with some level of cognitive impairment, using clinical and biological descriptors potentially related to AD. Our experiments over the constructed datasets were deliberately split into different levels of granularity in terms of subjects described with redescriptions to allow extracting general and specific, relevant AD-related information.

In this study, we found a number of surprisingly large and homogeneous groups and

many smaller, more specific subgroups of subjects that are described with informative redescriptions, in a large extent, confirming findings of previous works. After obtaining interesting and unexpected associations with PAPP-A, we used the introduced extensions to CLUS-RM algorithm to perform constraint-based redescription mining, allowing us to further explore associations of various attributes with PAPP-A. CLUS-RM is currently the only state of the art redescription mining algorithm capable of performing constraint-based redescription mining on data containing either numerical, categorical attributes or missing values. In addition, it is the only algorithm able to perform soft and suggested constraint-based redescription mining introduced in this work.

The clinical descriptor CDR (CDMEMORY, CDGLOBAL and CDR-SB) was shown to be a very good attribute for differentiating CN subjects and subjects with cognitive impairment. The gene variant APOE4 was associated with subjects with high level of cognitive impairment (LMCI and AD), whereas biological attribute SPARE_AD was highly correlated with subjects' diagnosis.

Additionally, high association of ADAS, CD and MOCA clinical descriptors with FDG, SPATIAL_AD, the volume of the entorhinal cortex and hippocampus were shown. When describing homogeneous groups of subjects with high level of cognitive impairment (LMCI and AD), the decrease of testosterone plasma levels, decrease of CNTF plasma levels and increase of BNP plasma levels were observed. Changes in other biological descriptors previously reported as being altered in AD, such as increase in levels of serum apolipoprotein B, plasma insulin, CSF MIF, Fas (CD95) ligand in the brain and decrease in plasma and CSF levels of SCF, were also observed.

Finally, probably the most important finding of this study was the detection of altered levels of those biological attributes, for subjects with cognitive impairment, that could have potential as therapeutic targets in AD, namely decreased leptin and increased angiopoietin-2 plasma levels. Decreasing leptin levels have been suggested to alleviate AD-related cellular changes in rabbit organotypic slices [62] and in human neuroblastoma cell culture [63, 64], suggesting that lowered leptin levels detected in AD subjects can be a possible target for developing supplementation therapies for reducing the progression of AD. The finding of increased angiopoietin-2 plasma levels in AD patients is in accordance with the study of Thirumangalakudi et al. [48], who showed that angiopoietin-2 is expressed by AD, but not control-derived microvessels, supporting the idea of targeting the angiogenic changes in the microcirculation of the AD brain as a potential therapeutic approach in AD [49]. It is evident from the above that analysing redescriptions from all three different datasets allowed finding many different associations. Some of these associations, such as SPATIAL_AD and PAPP-A are novel and require more in depth analysis with the supervision of domain experts. The correlation between SPATIAL_AD and PAPP-A is not statistically significant when computed for all subjects contained in the dataset R_3, but it is statistically significant when computed only on subjects with AD and $LMCI$ (which are the most interesting to study) at the significance level of 0.05.

The association of PAPP-A (previously known as pappalysin-1) with cognitive status is probably the most intriguing and novel finding of this study, as it has not been reported in such a context in the literature (PubMed search on 3 March 2016 with the keywords *pappalysin-1/Pregnancy-associated plasma protein-A (PAPP-A)* and *Alzheimer's disease* revealed only one publication [65]. That work also used the ADNI database and the ensemble machine learning algorithm of Random Forests, which revealed high association of PAPP-A with depressive symptoms [65]. The high importance of our finding lies in the fact that PAPP-A is a metalloproteinase, already known to cleave insulin-like growth factor binding proteins (IGFBPs). However, since it also shares similar substrates with the A Disintegrin and Metalloproteinase (ADAM)

family of enzymes (the main group of enzymes that act as α-secretase to physiologically cleave the amyloid precursor protein (APP) in the so-called non-amyloidogenic pathway [66], it could be directly involved in the metabolism of the amyloid precursor protein (APP). Based on the above, the role of PAPP-A in AD should be investigated in greater details.

Acknowledgments.

Data collection and sharing for this project was funded by the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) (National Institutes of Health Grant U01 AG024904) and DOD ADNI (Department of Defense award number W81XWH-12-2-0012). ADNI is funded by the National Institute on Aging, the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering, and through generous contributions from many private pharmaceutical companies and non-profit organizations.

The research was partly funded by the Slovenian Research Agency, the Future and Emerging Technologies EU funded Human Brain Project (HBP, grant agreement no. 604102), the European Commission funded MAESTRA project (Gr. no. 612944) and the Croatian Science Foundation funded projects: Machine Learning Algorithms for Insightful Analysis of Complex Data Structures (grant. no. 9623) and Tau protein hyperphosphorylation, aggregation and trans-synaptic transfer in Alzheimer's disease: cerebrospinal fluid analysis and assessment of potential neuroprotective compounds (grant. no. IP-2014-09-9730).

References

1. Cox DR. Note on Grouping. Journal of the American Statistical Association. 1957;52(280):543–547.

2. Fisher WD. On Grouping for Maximum Homogeneity. Journal of the American Statistical Association. 1958;53(284). doi:10.2307/2281952.

3. Ward JH. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. Journal of the American Statistical Association. 1963;58(301):236–244.

4. Jain AK, Murty MN, Flynn PJ. Data Clustering: A Review. ACM Computing Surveys. 1999;31(3):264–323. doi:10.1145/331499.331504.

5. Xu D, Tian Y. A Comprehensive Survey of Clustering Algorithms. Annals of Data Science. 2015;2(2):165–193. doi:10.1007/s40745-015-0040-1.

6. Michalski RS. Knowledge Acquisition Through Conceptual Clustering: A Theoretical Framework and an Algorithm for Partitioning Data into Conjunctive Concepts. Journal of Policy Analysis and Information Systems. 1980;4(3):219–244.

7. Fisher DH. Knowledge Acquisition Via Incremental Conceptual Clustering. Machine Learning. 1987;2(2):139–172. doi:10.1023/A:1022852608280.

8. Agrawal R, Mannila H, Srikant R, Toivonen H, Verkamo AI. Fast Discovery of Association Rules. In: Fayyad UM, Piatetsky-Shapiro G, Smyth P, Uthurusamy R, editors. Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. Menlo Park, CA, USA: American Association for Artificial Intelligence; 1996. p. 307–328. Available from: `http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=257938.257975`.

9. Klösgen W. Explora: A Multipattern and Multistrategy Discovery Assistant. In: Fayyad UM, Piatetsky-Shapiro G, Smyth P, Uthurusamy R, editors. Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. Menlo Park, CA, USA: American Association for Artificial Intelligence; 1996. p. 249–271. Available from: http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=257938.257965.

10. Wrobel S. An algorithm for multi-relational discovery of subgroups. In: Komorowski J, Zytkow J, editors. Principles of Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery. vol. 1263 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Berlin / Heidelberg: Springer; 1997. p. 78–87. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/3-540-63223-9_108.

11. Bay SD, Pazzani MJ. Detecting group differences: Mining contrast sets. Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery. 2001;5(3):213–246.

12. Ramakrishnan N, Kumar D, Mishra B, Potts M, Helm RF. Turning CARTwheels: An Alternating Algorithm for Mining Redescriptions. In: Proceedings of the 10th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. KDD '04. New York, NY, USA: ACM; 2004. p. 266–275. Available from: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1014052.1014083.

13. van Leeuwen M, Galbrun E. Association Discovery in Two-View Data. IEEE Trans Knowl Data Eng. 2015;27(12):3190–3202. doi:10.1109/TKDE.2015.2453159.

14. ADNI database: last access 17.12.2015.;. Available from: http://adni.loni.usc.edu/.

15. Weiner MW, et al. The Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative: A review of papers published since its inception. Alzheimer's & Dementia. Journal of the Alzheimer's Association. 2012;8:1–68.

16. Gamberger D, Ženko B, Mitelpunkt A, Lavrač N, ADNI. In: Guo Y, Friston K, Aldo F, Hill S, Peng H, editors. Brain Informatics and Health. vol. 9250 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer International Publishing; 2015. p. 57–66.

17. Gamberger D, Ženko B, Mitelpunkt A, Lavrač N. Multilayer Clustering: Biomarker Driven Segmentation of Alzheimer's Disease Patient Population. In: Ortuño F, Rojas I, editors. Bioinformatics and Biomedical Engineering. vol. 9043 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer International Publishing; 2015. p. 134–145.

18. Breskvar M, Ženko B, Džeroski S. Relating Biological and Clinical Features of Alzheimer's Patients With Predictive Clustering Trees. In: Proceedings of the 18th International Information Society. vol. E of IS'15. Ljubljana, Slovenia; 2015. p. 5–8.

19. Smith G E, Bondi M W. Mild Cognitive Impairment and Dementia. Oxford University Press; 2013.

20. Galbrun E, Miettinen P. From black and white to full color: extending redescription mining outside the Boolean world. Statistical Analysis and Data Mining. 2012;5(4):284–303. doi:10.1002/sam.11145.

21. Mihelčić M, Džeroski S, Lavrač N, Šmuc T. Redescription mining with multi-label Predictive Clustering Trees. In: Proceedings of the 4th workshop on New Frontiers in Mining Complex Patterns. NFMCP '15. Porto, Portugal; 2015. p. 86–97. Available from: http://www.di.uniba.it/~ceci/micFiles/NFMCP2015.pdf.

22. Mihelčić M, Džeroski S, Lavrač N, Šmuc T. Redescription Mining with Multi-target Predictive Clustering Trees. In: Ceci M, Loglisci C, Manco G, Masciari E, Ras ZW, editors. New Frontiers in Mining Complex Patterns - 4th International Workshop, NFMCP 2015, Held in Conjunction with ECML-PKDD 2015, Porto, Portugal, Revised Selected Papers. vol. 9607 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer; 2015. p. 125–143. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39315-5_9.

23. Galbrun E. Methods for Redescription mining, Phd thesis. University of Helsinki; 2013.

24. Zaki MJ, Ramakrishnan N. Reasoning About Sets Using Redescription Mining. In: Proceedings of the 11th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery in Data Mining. KDD '05. New York, NY, USA: ACM; 2005. p. 364–373. Available from: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1081870.1081912.

25. Parida L, Ramakrishnan N. Redescription Mining: Structure Theory and Algorithms. In: Veloso MM, Kambhampati S, editors. AAAI. AAAI Press / The MIT Press; 2005. p. 837–844. Available from: http://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/conf/aaai/aaai2005.html#ParidaR05.

26. Gallo A, Miettinen P, Mannila H. Finding Subgroups having Several Descriptions: Algorithms for Redescription Mining. In: SDM. SIAM; 2008. p. 334–345. Available from: http://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/conf/sdm/sdm2008.html#GalloMM08.

27. Zinchenko T. Redescription Mining Over non-Binary Data Sets Using Decision Trees, M.Sc. thesis. Universität des Saarlandes Saarbrücken. Germany; 2014.

28. Blockeel H, De Raedt L. Top-down Induction of First-order Logical Decision Trees. Artificial Intelligence. 1998;101(1-2):285–297. doi:10.1016/S0004-3702(98)00034-4.

29. Kocev D, Vens C, Struyf J, Dzeroski S. Tree ensembles for predicting structured outputs. Pattern Recognition. 2013;46(3):817–833. doi:10.1016/j.patcog.2012.09.023.

30. Adaszewski S, Dukart J, Kherif F, Frackowiak R, Draganski B, ADNI, et al. How early can we predict Alzheimer's disease using computational anatomy? Neurobiology of aging. 2013;34(12):2815–2826.

31. Liu X, Tosun D, Weiner MW, Schuff N, Initiative ADN, et al. Locally linear embedding (LLE) for MRI based Alzheimer's disease classification. NeuroImage. 2013;83:148–157.

32. Dukart J, Mueller K, Barthel H, Villringer A, Sabri O, Schroeter ML, et al. Meta-analysis based SVM classification enables accurate detection of Alzheimer's disease across different clinical centers using FDG-PET and MRI. Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging. 2013;212(3):230–236.

33. Doraiswamy P, Sperling R, Johnson K, Reiman E, Wong T, Sabbagh M, et al. Florbetapir F 18 amyloid PET and 36-month cognitive decline: a prospective multicenter study. Molecular Psychiatry. 2014;19(9):1044–1051.

34. Donovan NJ, Wadsworth LP, Lorius N, Locascio JJ, Rentz DM, Johnson KA, et al. Regional cortical thinning predicts worsening apathy and hallucinations across the Alzheimer disease spectrum. The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry. 2014;22(11):1168–1179.

35. Guo LH, Alexopoulos P, Wagenpfeil S, Kurz A, Perneczky R, ADNI, et al. Brain size and the compensation of Alzheimer's disease symptoms: a longitudinal cohort study. Alzheimer's & Dementia. 2013;9(5):580–586.

36. Hostage CA, Roy Choudhury K, Doraiswamy PM, Petrella JR, ADNI. Dissecting the Gene Dose-Effects of the APOE epsilon4 and epsilon2 Alleles on Hippocampal Volumes in Aging and Alzheimer's Disease. PLoS ONE. 2013;8(2):e54483. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054483.

37. Risacher SL, Kim S, Shen L, Nho K, Foroud T, Green RC, et al. The role of apolipoprotein E (APOE) genotype in early mild cognitive impairment (E-MCI). Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience. 2013;5.

38. Gamberger D, Mihelčić M, Lavrač N. Multilayer Clustering: A Discovery Experiment on Country Level Trading Data. In: Proceedings of the 17th International Conference, Discovery Science, DS 2014, Bled, Slovenia; 2014. p. 87–98.

39. Zhao JV, Lam TH, Jiang C, Cherny SS, Liu B, Cheng KK, et al. A Mendelian randomization study of testosterone and cognition in men. Scientific Reports. 2016;6.

40. Xu J, Xia LL, Song N, Chen SD, Wang G. Testosterone, Estradiol, and Sex Hormone-Binding Globulin in Alzheimer's Disease: A Meta-Analysis. Current Alzheimer Research. 2016;13(3):215–222.

41. Hogervorst E, Bandelow S, Combrinck M, Smith A. Low free testosterone is an independent risk factor for Alzheimer's disease. Experimental Gerontology. 2004;39(11):1633–1639.

42. Wittert G, et al. The relationship between sleep disorders and testosterone in men. Asian Journal of Andrology. 2014;16(2):262.

43. Šimić G, Leko MB, Wray S, Harrington CR, Delalle I, Jovanov-Milošević N, et al. Monoaminergic Neuropathology in Alzheimer's disease. Progress in Neurobiology. 2016;doi:10.1016/j.pneurobio.2016.04.001.

44. Papasozomenos SC, Shanavas A. Testosterone prevents the heat shock-induced overactivation of glycogen synthase kinase-3β but not of cyclin-dependent kinase 5 and c-Jun NH2-terminal kinase and concomitantly abolishes hyperphosphorylation of τ: Implications for Alzheimer's disease. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 2002;99(3):1140–1145.

45. Rosario ER, Carroll J, Pike CJ. Testosterone regulation of Alzheimer-like neuropathology in male 3xTg-AD mice involves both estrogen and androgen pathways. Brain Research. 2010;1359:281–290.

46. Gelernter J, Dyck CV, van Kammen DP, Malison R, Price LH, Cubells JF, et al. Ciliary neurotrophic factor null allele frequencies in schizophrenia, affective disorders, and Alzheimer's disease. American Journal of Medical Genetics. 1997;74(5):497–500.

47. Marwarha G, Ghribi O. Leptin signaling and Alzheimer's disease. American Journal of Neurodegenerative Disease. 2012;1(3):245.

48. Thirumangalakudi L, Samany PG, Owoso A, Wiskar B, Grammas P. Angiogenic proteins are expressed by brain blood vessels in Alzheimer's disease. Journal of Alzheimer's Disease. 2006;10(1):111–118.

49. Grammas P, Tripathy D, Sanchez A, Yin X, Luo J. Brain microvasculature and hypoxia-related proteins in Alzheimer's disease. International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Pathology. 2011;4(6):616.

50. Kondziella D, Göthlin M, Fu M, Zetterberg H, Wallin A. B-type natriuretic peptide plasma levels are elevated in subcortical vascular dementia. Neuroreport. 2009;20(9):825–827.

51. Caramelli P, Nitrini R, Maranhao R, Lourenço A, Damasceno M, Vinagre C, et al. Increased apolipoprotein B serum concentration in Alzheimer's disease. Acta Neurologica Scandinavica. 1999;100(1):61–63.

52. Watson GS, Craft S. The role of insulin resistance in the pathogenesis of Alzheimer's disease. CNS Drugs. 2003;17(1):27–45.

53. Bacher M, Deuster O, Aljabari B, Egensperger R, Neff F, Jessen F, et al. The role of macrophage migration inhibitory factor in Alzheimer's disease. Molecular Medicine. 2010;16(3-4):116.

54. Su JH, Anderson AJ, Cribbs DH, Tu C, Tong L, Kesslack P, et al. Fas and Fas Ligand are associated with neuritic degeneration in the AD brain and participate in β-amyloid-induced neuronal death. Neurobiology of Disease. 2003;12(3):182–193.

55. Laske C, Stellos K, Stransky E, Seizer P, Akcay O, Eschweiler GW, et al. Decreased plasma and cerebrospinal fluid levels of stem cell factor in patients with early Alzheimer's disease. Journal of Alzheimer's Disease. 2008;15(3):451–460.

56. Smith AD, Smith SM, de Jager CA, Whitbread P, Johnston C, Agacinski G, et al. Homocysteine-Lowering by B Vitamins Slows the Rate of Accelerated Brain Atrophy in Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Randomized Controlled Trial. PLoS ONE. 2010;5(9):1–10. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0012244.

57. Douaud G, Refsum H, de Jager CA, Jacoby R, Nichols TE, Smith SM, et al. Preventing Alzheimer's disease-related gray matter atrophy by B-vitamin treatment. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 2013;110(23):9523–9528.

58. Gröber U, Kisters K, Schmidt J. Neuroenhancement with vitamin B12—underestimated neurological significance. Nutrients. 2013;5(12):5031–5045.

59. Ford AH, Almeida OP. Effect of homocysteine lowering treatment on cognitive function: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Journal of Alzheimer's Disease. 2012;29(1):133–149.

60. Clarke R, Bennett D, Parish S, Lewington S, Skeaff M, Eussen SJ, et al. Effects of homocysteine lowering with B vitamins on cognitive aging: meta-analysis of 11 trials with cognitive data on 22,000 individuals. The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 2014;100(2):657–666.

61. Shipley SM, Frederick MC, Filley CM, Kluger BM. Potential for misdiagnosis in community-acquired PET scans for dementia. Neurology: Clinical Practice. 2013;3(4):305–312.

62. Marwarha G, Dasari B, Prasanthi JR, Schommer J, Ghribi O. Leptin reduces the accumulation of Aβ and phosphorylated tau induced by 27-hydroxycholesterol in rabbit organotypic slices. Journal of Alzheimer's Disease. 2010;19(3):1007–1019.

63. Marwarha G, Dasari B, Ghribi O. Endoplasmic reticulum stress-induced CHOP activation mediates the down-regulation of leptin in human neuroblastoma SH-SY5Y cells treated with the oxysterol 27-hydroxycholesterol. Cellular Signalling. 2012;24(2):484–492.

64. Marwarha G, Raza S, Meiers C, Ghribi O. Leptin attenuates BACE1 expression and amyloid-β genesis via the activation of SIRT1 signaling pathway. Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA)-Molecular Basis of Disease. 2014;1842(9):1587–1595.

65. Arnold S, Xie S, Leung Y, Wang L, Kling M, Han X, et al. Plasma biomarkers of depressive symptoms in older adults. Translational Psychiatry. 2012;2(1):e65.

66. Kuhn PH, Colombo AV, Schusser B, Dreymueller D, Wetzel S, Schepers U, et al. Systematic substrate identification indicates a central role for the metalloprotease ADAM10 in axon targeting and synapse function. eLife. 2016;5:e12748.